

Planning Commission

**September 13, 2018
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

For agenda item detail see the Staff Report and other supporting documents
included in the complete meeting packet.

Public Comment will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
 - a. August 9, 2018
5. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
6. New Business
 - a. **Transportation Master Plan** – Discussion/Direction
7. Planning Commission Comments
8. Staff Comments
 - a. Development Review Audit: Wednesday, September 26, 2018
 - b. State Planning Conference
9. Items Tentatively Scheduled for the regular meeting October 11, 2018:
 - a. Front Street Partners PUD Amendment (Formally Prouty Commercial Building PUD – Change in exterior materials
 - b. Marijuana Ordinance Updates
 - c. Coabana - A PUD sign waiver request (701-B Main St.)
 - d. Christ the Servant SRU – Columbarium
 - e. Vaisala – A PUD Amendment to allow an addition
10. Adjourn

***Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
August 9th, 2018
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM***

Call to Order – Chair Brauneis called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Steve Brauneis, Chair
David Hsu, Vice Chair
Debra Williams, Secretary
Dietrich Hoefner
Jeff Moline
Tom Rice

Commission Members Absent: Keaton Howe

Staff Members Present: Rob Zuccaro, Dir of Planning & Building Safety
Kristin Dean, Principal Planner
Amelia Brackett, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Hoefner moved to add approval of April minutes to agenda. Hsu seconded.

Moline moved and Hsu seconded a motion to approve the August 9th 2018 agenda with an amendment to approve the April minutes. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Hsu moved and Williams seconded to approve the April 12th minutes. Hoefner abstained due to his absence at the April meeting.

Rice moved and Moline seconded to approve the July 12th minutes. Williams and Brauneis recused themselves due to their absence at the July meeting. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

NEW BUSINESS – PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Coal Creek Station – A request for revisions to the approved Final Plat and Final PUD Resolution No 11-2018. Continued from July 12, 2018.

- Applicant and Representative: Coal Creek Station Properties, LLC
- Case Manager: Kristin Dean, Principal Planner

Notice posted in Boulder *Daily Camera* on June 24th and in all other required locations on June 22nd, 2018. This is a continuance from a July meeting due to a lack of quorum at that meeting.

Moline recused himself from the public hearing due to his work for Boulder County Parks and Open Space, which manages the land across the street from the development.

Rice recused himself from the public hearing as Gary Brothers is his architect on a personal project. When the project first came to the Commission, Rice did not have Brothers under contract.

Dean described the history of the Coal Creek application. The application was approved in May of 2016 with eight conditions. Since that time, there have been changes to the outstanding conditions, including compliance with a Public Works letter and additional items that the applicant would like to have changed. Staff has also pulled all the conditions from other departments' letters, resulting in a long list. These outstanding items are under consideration at this meeting.

There are also several items that are changing with the new application that need commission review:

- (1) Revise the drainage plan to remove the detention pond proposed on Lots 19 & 20, Robert D. Giacomo Addition and replace with an underground pipe across these properties.
- (2) Modify the lot boundaries for Lots 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18, Block 6 to ensure buildings meet setback requirements.
- (3) Formally request that the City maintain the alley adjacent to Lots 10-20, Robert Di Giacomo Addition.

In addition, new information has come to light over the last month:

- (1) A city-owned property is included in the subdivision.
- (2) Outlot I, which serves as access to several units in Block 2 and also serves to connect Front Street to the alley, was identified as "Public Access" under the 2016 approved plat, but was changed to "Private Access" under the recent revisions.
- (3) The access easement from Cannon Circle, through Block 1, Lot 1 to Lot 1, Crystal Estates, Replat A does not extend far enough to include historic access points to that property.

Dean entered two letters into the record received the day of the Commission meeting, one from C-DOT and one from Boulder County Open Space. Dean also entered Commissioner William's email into the record. C-DOT and Open Space have been solicited for comments on the plan in the past, but they have recently revisited the details of the application. One of these issues is the concern from Open Space over access to their land, which staff and the applicant plan to address.

Staff recommends approval of Resolution No. 11, Series 2018 since the changes have to be met before Council and are more technical than substantial.

Hsu asked if there were waivers to be considered for the ditch easement and how the waiver procedure worked.

Dean stated that the applicant did not ask for a waiver. They will be addressing the issue before coming to Council. She added that the Commission would not have to re-review the waiver. Zuccaro asked the Hsu put his opinion about the waiver on the record.

Hsu requested a discussion on the setback requirements and what would be required in the waiver.

Dean stated that they would need a zero-foot setback. The approved lot did not encroach into the area in question, but the design of the houses required pushing the boundaries out to meet the setback requirements. Staff prefers not to plat property with ditch easements to avoid conflict of interest.

Brauneis asked about the zero-foot setback.

Zuccaro described that staff thought about the process as improving a PUD that had already been approved. Those improvements triggered the setback changes, since staff did not think the applicant's original request for a no-build zone was enforceable. As a workaround, staff recommended the setback waiver. Any portion of the building could go up to the setback line but not over the line. The actual setback requirement was 5 feet from the sides and 10 feet from the front.

Hoefner asked why we were still seeing issues in August 2018 that were raised in April of 2016. Hoefner asked if the applicant had been sitting on the application or if Public Works was driving the delay. He expressed a concern that the long list of conditions will change between Planning Commission and City Council.

Dean responded that staff had been working through conditions over the past year. Some of the points have not been finalized to the point where Public Works could sign off.

Zuccaro stated that having this many conditions was unique but staff felt that the conditions were doable before the City Council meeting. Staff was also requiring completion of the conditions before the applicant goes to Council.

Hoefner asked if they could make a recommendation that substantial changes be remanded to the Planning Commission. Zuccaro stated that they could.

Hoefner asked about the open ditch.

Dean replied that the ditch company asked that the water be piped and had compromised with a more narrow easement. After talking to staff, the applicant has agreed to have it piped.

Williams asked about the setbacks on Lot 18 and if there was water where the building would be built.

Dean responded that the pipe was in the center of the easement and the property was at the edge of the easement. There was a historical ditch easement in that location.

Williams asked about the current service levels at the intersection and how the Highway 42 project would affect those levels.

Dean stated that the access plan had already been approved. C-DOT would make sure that the final intersection design will meet the level of service requirements.

Zuccaro stated that the level of service should not change from when it was approved a couple of years ago. The C-DOT letter refers to the geometry of the intersection, which could impact level of service of some of the movements but the impact would not be significant. C-DOT was mainly concerned with the safety of an offset intersection.

Zuccaro and Williams discussed future plans for how to deal with the service issue. Williams stated that she hoped someone would analyze it down the line. Zuccaro stated that it was not staff's intent to analyze the issue but the Commission could make it a condition. The applicant would have to do an additional traffic analysis. Williams responded that she did not think it needed to be a condition.

Brauneis asked how much of an impact the elimination of the detention pond would have on the capacity of the regional detention pond.

Zuccaro stated that the storm water retention requirements were being met on-site.

Williams asked if the City had other joint management plans with HOAs similar to the proposed alley management for this project.

Zuccaro stated that there were a lot of private roads with public access in Louisville and a few instances with alley improvements that have required private management. Any of the alleys in this development that serve the subdivision would be maintained by the HOA. The applicant pointed out that they should not have to maintain the part of the alley that did not serve their subdivision, so half of the alley is private and half of it is public.

Williams asked about the two drainage sites.

Dean stated that the ditch was not providing drainage, it was moving water historically. She clarified that the HOA would not maintain anything going under Highway 42.

Williams stated the arrangement as she understood it was a huge burden for an HOA.

Dean stated that the other commercial properties in the proposal are also required to maintain the detention pond and other shared aspects. This type of division of responsibility is standard for the City.

Zuccaro added that staff did not know the final structure of the management agreement. Staff will work with the development agreements to define management responsibilities.

Williams asked if the Public Works concerns were mainly drainage and if the drainage plan was designed based off the 100-year flood plan.

Dean responded that drainage was part of the Public Works letter, but there were other issues as well. Zuccaro confirmed that it was based on the 100-year plan.

Brauneis asked for other questions of staff. Seeing none, he invited the applicant to present.

Gary Brothers, 1737 Lois Court in Lafayette, reminded the Commission that there had been changes in planning staff and city management since the application began. The current application presented no changes to roadways, the character of the buildings, or their sizes and locations. Brothers admitted that one of his oversights in agreeing to the setbacks was that on lot 6, there were zero lot lines. The setback requirement meant that those lot lines had to be extended five feet. He presented a list of seven conditions to the Commission to be considered for removal from the resolution.

Hsu made motion to enter the applicant's list of seven conditions into the record. Hoefner seconded. Voice vote. Motion passed unanimously.

Hsu and Brothers discussed the remaining steps in the application process. Hsu asked if the applicant would change the lot line from being in the ditch easement along with the waivers. Brothers replied yes. Hsu asked how long it would take to resolve the remaining conditions on the list. Brothers replied that a lot of them were small modifications. Hsu asked what would happen if it were delayed another month. Brothers stated that it would be frustrating, as the longer the process continues the more issues that come up.

Hoefner asked for additional frustrations from the applicant.

Brothers stated that frustration was not productive and that they wanted it to be a positive project.

Hoefner asked if staff could address the applicant's seven points.

Zuccaro reiterated that staff recommended approving the application. He addressed the applicant's seven conditions in sequence:

- (1) Keep this condition. There have been issues where the PUD and the subdivision do not match and that creates issues since all the documents are legal documents. It is standard practice to have that kind of measurement on one page within the PUD that shows that everything lines up.
- (2) Remove this condition.
- (3) Change this condition to add a note requesting a typical aisle and parking space, not that they dimension every spot. This is standard practice.
- (4) Change this condition to add a note on the plans to defer that issue. Zuccaro noted that it is standard to have an architectural elevation of the trash enclosures.
- (5) Change this condition to add a note on the plans to defer this issue.

(6) Zuccaro stated that the ADA issue could be deferred, even though it was not standard and that not having clear ADA standards met ahead of time has caused problems in the past.

(7) Change this condition to read that the easement width and location can be deferred.

Zuccaro summarized that there were no major flaws in the design that staff was aware of. Staff's conditions were attempts to avoid future roadblocks and to follow best practice.

Hoefner requested further comment from the applicant.

Brothers stated that each issue had been addressed in meetings with staff.

Brauneis asked for commissioner comments.

Hsu stated that he sympathized with the applicant. He supported changing the lot line on Lot 18, the waiver, and the lot dimensions condition. Hsu thought that the parking space requirement could be clearer but that the applicant just needed to notate one typical space. He suggested that staff and the applicant come to an agreement on the remaining conditions on the list provided by the applicant.

Williams asked for clarification on the remaining steps between this Commission hearing and the Council hearing and asked if the number of conditions was typical. She also stated that it was important to have things as clear as possible on an application since once it's built, it's built.

Dean replied that it was an atypical number. She added that the majority of the conditions were required to be addressed before the Council hearing. They could be addressed directly or through an agreement that meets the intent of the conditions. Overall, the conditions were meant to avoid problems when it comes to administering construction documents.

Hoefner echoed Hsu and Zuccaro's comments. He thought that the application included many conditions that have already been addressed and that it included substantial concessions by the applicant. He suggested approving as drafted with the removal of conditions 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on the applicant's list and adding a condition that staff and the applicant address them through additional notes on the application.

Hsu stated that the waiver question for the setbacks on Lot 18 was the messiest issue that would go before the Council. Though he supported it, the waiver was still vague.

Williams clarified the nature of Hsu's concern, pointing out that normally the Commission would approve a waiver specifically, but in this case they do not have a formal waiver request before the Commission.

Hsu confirmed that that was his concern.

Zuccaro stated that there was public notice and that the waiver requirements were codified in a staff condition. He did not think staff could bring more information to the Commission that would help them make the decision on the waiver.

Hoefner asked if the Commission could approve a request that had not been asked for.

Zuccaro stated that they could recommend approval of the waiver to City Council based on the waiver criteria while noting that the application still required a waiver request.

Brauneis stated that he was in favor of the motion with the conditions and with the request that staff err on the side of remanding the application back to the Commission with any significant changes.

Zuccaro read his proposals for the applicant's conditions and stated that they should be met before the Council hearing:

- (1) Staff recommends no change to this condition.
- (2) Staff recommends removal of this condition.
- (3) Replace current condition with "provide typical parking and drive-aisle dimensions that demonstrate compliance with adopted city standards."
- (4) Add a note to the PUD plans that the trash enclosure is designed to meet CDDSG standards and guidelines to be verified by city staff at the time of building permit review.
- (5) Add a note to the PUD plans that the final sod and seed mix and the location of mulch will be reviewed with the submittal of the building permit and Public Works construction documents and shall comply with adopted city standards.
- (6) Add a note to the PUD plans stating that all ADA requirements must be met and verified at the time of the building permit review.

Zuccaro stated that he was willing to get rid of number 6 as well, since it will be verified anyway. In general, staff likes to see this ahead of time but considering the circumstances staff is willing to omit this condition.

- (7) Applicant will work with Excel to verify the final location and width of all easement requirements and revise the subdivision plat as needed.

Hsu requested the addition of a waiver request before going ahead to Council.

Hoefner suggested that Rob read everything back clean including Hsu's waiver amendment. Zuccaro read the amendments and conditions to be included in the Commission's motions.

Zuccaro proposed that the Commission's resolution recommending approval to City Council shall be amended as follows in reference to the document supplied by the applicant titled, "Items in Resolution No 11 Series 2018 that I have issues with." The referring document has the original condition numbers listed on it, here replaced with items number one through seven. Amendments based on that document are as follows:

- (1) Staff recommends no change to this condition.
- (2) Staff recommends removal of this condition.
- (3) Replace current condition with "provide typical parking and drive-aisle dimensions that demonstrate compliance with adopted city standards."

- (4) Add a note to the PUD plans that the trash enclosure is designed to meet CDDSG standards and guidelines to be verified by city staff at the time of building permit review.
- (5) Add a note to the PUD plans that the final sod and seed mix and the location of mulch will be reviewed with the submittal of the building permit and Public Works construction documents and shall comply with adopted city standards.
- (6) Staff recommends removal of this condition.
- (7) Applicant will work with Excel to verify the final location and width of all easement requirements and revise the subdivision plat as needed.

Further, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 11 Series 2018 shall include recognition that the zero lot line waiver for lot 18 block 6 has been discussed by the Commission and the Commission has considered the condition in light of the waiver PUD criteria in the Municipal Code and find that it is warranted under those criteria.

Brauneis asked for additional commissioner comments.

Hoefner will support the motion as Zuccaro read it. He added that after the applicant left last time a number of commissioners made comments on the record expressing that they were sorry that they had to come back a second month in a row. Hsu and Williams did not have additional comments.

Hsu motioned to approve Resolution 11, Series 2018 as amended by Planning Director Zuccaro. Hoefner seconded. Roll call. Approved unanimously.

Recess at 8:15 PM. Hearing restarted at 8:30 PM.

St. Louis Parish and Commercial Park Preliminary Plat and Ascent Church Preliminary PUD – A request for consideration of a preliminary plat to create two parcels, four lots, and one outlot and a preliminary PUD for an approximately 48,623 square foot religious institution. Resolution No. 13-2018.

- Applicant and Representative: Ascent Church
- Case Manager: Kristin Dean, Principal Planner

Notice published in the Boulder *Daily Camera* on July 22nd, 2018 and at all other postings on July 20th, 2018.

Hoefner recused himself from this item due to a conflict of interest.

Dean explained that a preliminary review was required for this application to make sure the plan is going to work and that three property owners were involved in the plat even though the PUD is only for the Ascent Church property. The application also had a condition in the form of a note that the owner will construct the sidewalk adjacent to Dillon Road. She entered into the record the resolution, commissioner emails to staff about clarifying questions on the staff packet, a revised letter from Ascent, a letter from the Archdiocese, and two additional public comments received via email after the staff packet went out. She described the phases of development as outlined in the application and the request for the deferment of the Public Land Dedication Fee for two of the property owners.

Dean laid out options for the Commission to consider:

- (1) Require the full land dedication fee be paid at the time of the plat.
- (2) Accept deferment request as proposed. This option will help catalyze development in this area by opening up commercial lots.
- (3) Require a different amount of the Public Land Dedication Fee to be paid. Staff does not know if the applicant would agree to this option.

Dean addressed Hsu's emailed question about precedent. Staff has not had time to make a thorough evaluation. Clementine Filing No. 2 requested a deferment tied to the building permit for each property under the same set of regulations. It was supported by City Council.

Dean asked for the commissioners' opinions on the two options for trail design.

Staff recommended approval with one condition. The recommendation is subject to how the Commission wants to move forward with the public land dedication fee.

Moline asked who determined the ratio of acres and cash in lieu.

Dean replied that the City and the applicant could both determine the ratio and whether the City wants the land.

Moline asked about the PCZD agreement process.

Dean stated that whatever changes make it through Council would need to be reflected in the PCZD agreement.

Rice asked if dedicating land for public use had been considered as an alternative option to the land dedication.

Dean replied that future property owners could have a design that includes additional land dedication, but the City had not identified any land that the City would like to acquire at this time.

Rice pointed out that the Archdiocese needed to respond to that. He also asked if the known loose ends as listed in the staff report– concrete drainage base issues, dimensions for access path to fire hose, signage issues – should be built in as conditions to be addressed before the final PUD.

Dean replied that since this was a preliminary review phase, staff did not want to become too constricted by additional conditions. She added that the staff suggestions were in the record.

Rice stated that staff's approach worked but that the issues should be addressed in some way before the final PUD.

Hsu asked when the City would know if the traffic signal was warranted.

Dean stated that each PUD needed a traffic assessment. The applicant was putting up a financial guarantee for the signal in the subdivision agreement.

Zuccaro added that C-DOT controls whether something warrants a signal after an applicant submits a traffic study.

Hsu asked if the other parties would have to do another assessment in the future if the payment were to be deferred.

Dean confirmed that with each application would require an updated appraisal of the property.

Williams asked what kinds of businesses would front the church.

Dean stated that there was a list of approved uses for the zone.

Williams asked if drive-thrus were an approved use.

Zuccaro stated that drive-thrus were SRUs. He added that the development was being laid out for individual buildings such as banks and buildings and not an in-line strip mall layout.

Brauneis asked for the applicant presentation.

Pastor Jim Candy described his church's involvement in community engagement and his plans to use the new location for more such engagement. He described the risks to the church in moving to a new place and conducting a building project. He explained why they were asking to defer the land fees, saying that Ascent Church could not afford to take on those fees and the other applicants were requesting the deferrals. He addressed the subdivision modification request and described how the PUD met the criteria. He stated that this was a unique situation with three different owners so it was not setting precedent. He did not think that the property would ever be developed concurrently among the three owners. Finally, he stated that the City would benefit from the application by getting land, cash, commercial development and tax revenue. Getting the deferment was a faster path to getting the cash-in-lieu, since the development itself would help the other owners pay it back.

Brauneis asked for questions of the applicant.

Moline asked if Ascent Church was a tenant or an owner at the Sam's Club Location.

Candy replied that they were tenants.

Williams asked what Candy predicted for the commercial development of the building.

Candy stated that there was interest in the front due to afternoon traffic, but he could not say specifically who had expressed interest.

Hsu stated that the weakest argument pertains to number four on the modification request stating that there were no reasonable design alternatives. He asked the applicant to talk about the design alternatives in addition to the financial ones already discussed.

Candy stated that the City did not want the land.

Hsu clarified that he was thinking of design as a more structural question.

Dean stated that Ascent was open to public access to the playground area, but Parks was not interested in acquiring another park to maintain. These properties were not on the priority list for City acquisition for the parks department.

Brauneis asked for public comment.

Amanda Fox, 384 Jackson Circle in Louisville and speaking on behalf of several members of the public in attendance at the meeting, stated that the church served needs in the community, including programs in the police department. She also described how the church has been involved in Louisville schools, particularly for after-school programs.

Moline moved to enter the materials board into the record. Motion passes unanimously.

Williams asked what the shiny metal on the board was being used for.

A member of the public showed that it was decorative parts of the roof, not the entire roof.

Brauneis asked for commissioner comments.

Rice stated that he was enthusiastic about this application similar to his feeling on the first hearing in the fall of 2017. He liked the orientation of the building. He thanked the applicant for making a big investment in the community.

Moline supported the application. He was happy with the staff perspective in general on the application. He supported the option that was consistent with the Open Space Board's review and recommendation.

Hsu appreciated the risk and investment of the application. He did not think that the application had satisfied number four in the subdivision modification request since he thought there could be additional design alternatives.

Williams stated that the subdivision modification request had been met as she could not think of any reasonable alternatives to the request. She concluded that she was inclined to support the application.

Rice responded to Hsu's concerns, pointing out that the preamble language read, "all the following requirements insofar as applicable." He stated that the design question was not applicable to this situation since the issue did not have design elements to it.

Brauneis echoed Rice's interpretation, adding that it seemed the City preferred money instead of a park. He found the deferral rational. He concurred with Moline's recommendation for the trail design.

Hsu stated that Rice had a good point on the "insofar as applicable" language in the preamble. He was still leaning toward a no but he thought it was a good point.

Dean asked about the trail design.

Rice and Williams added their support for the elevated trail design.

Dean asked the Commission to clarify their thoughts on the deferral.

Rice stated that he was planning to put it in the motion. Moline and Williams voiced support for deferment. Hsu did not.

Motion made by Rice for approval of Resolution Number 13, Series 2018 to include the approval of a deferral for the two non-developing parts of the plat until they develop and the condition that requires this note to be revised to state the sidewalk will be constructed by the developer with the first development on the St. Louis Parish property. Moline seconded . Motion passed 4-1. Hsu voted nay.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Follow-up discussion from the joint study session with City Council

Deferred to next discussion.

STAFF COMMENTS

ITEMS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR THE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2018

Marijuana Ordinance Update.

Williams stated that she would not be present at the September meeting.

Adjourn:

Moline made motion to adjourn. Hsu seconded. Brauneis adjourned meeting at 9:55 PM.

ITEM:	Transportation Master Plan
PLANNER:	Rob Zuccaro, Director of Planning and Building Safety Lisa Ritchie, Associate Planner
APPLICANT:	City of Louisville
REQUEST:	Planning Commission discussion on the Transportation Master Plan and draft goals.

SUMMARY:

On April 17, 2018, City Council approved a contract with Traffic Engineers, Inc. (TEI) to develop the City's first Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The scope of work approved with the contract outlined several steps the consultant and the City will take to develop the plan. Staff and the consultant are working through *Phase 1, Existing Conditions, Problem Definition and Goals* and recently began public outreach at local events.

The final TMP will serve to set transportation goals and policies for the City with an understanding of both regional and local influences. The plan will also set short and mid-term priorities for multi-modal transportation infrastructure and funding options that will be used for capital improvement planning.

At this meeting, TEI will be making a presentation to provide the Commission an update on the project and will be seeking feedback on the draft goals, which are discussed below.

BACKGROUND:

In mid-2017 the City of Louisville began exploring the need for a comprehensive transportation plan that would guide decisions and funding around transportation investments needed across the entire city. A transportation master plan would consider both local and regional transportation influences, how our current system is positioned to address trends in transportation, and provide a data-informed road-map for prioritizing future needs.

The TMP will provide a long-range vision and will serve as a guiding document for short and mid-term improvements to local and regional transportation and multimodal networks. With influence from the City of Louisville's comprehensive plan and other guiding documents, the TMP will outline the City's vision for our ultimate transportation system, the policies necessary to support that system, and capital projects that are prioritized with consideration of funding constraints. Through the TMP the City will be more strategic with existing and future investments in the transportation network, and improve mobility and access in a way that is safe and convenient. The TMP will also recognize evolving technology and future trends in transportation systems and service delivery, and how they may be integrated now and in future years.

DISCUSSION

As noted above, the project is currently in Phase 1, which includes data collection, plan review and existing conditions analysis. Staff has been meeting regularly with TEI to gather and analyze existing plans, data, and conditions.

Plan Review

There are a number of existing City and regional plans that have been reviewed to inform the development of the TMP, including:

- Sustainability Action Plan
- 2013 Comprehensive Plan
- Small Area Plans
- Downtown Parking and Pedestrian Action Plan
- Trails and Wayfinding Plan
- Corridor studies
- US 36 First and Final Mile Study
- Regional Plans (NAMS, RTP)
- Housing Studies

These existing plans provide the base for the TMP, and many have overlapping goals. The TMP will identify linkages to existing plans and provide structure and recommendations to meet goals and assess progress over time.

Data Collection and Existing Conditions Analysis

Staff and the consultant have gathered existing data related to transportation metrics, such as crash analysis, transit ridership, and traffic volumes. Additional data has been compiled and collected regarding the existing transportation system, such as roadway geometry, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as future projects planned in the CIP and other planned regional improvements. This background data will be supplemented with public input and additional study regarding how these facilities are utilized and experienced, as well as growth projections, to guide future improvements called for in the final TMP.

Public Outreach

The initial public outreach efforts began in August at Street Faire, Farmers' Market, the Labor Day event and other local events. Staff and TEI are collecting feedback from the public to identify community needs and barriers, what the community wants, and to refine the project vision and goals. A public open house is scheduled for September 10th and updates are also planned for the September meetings of the Open Space Advisory Board and the Sustainability Advisory Board. Separate focus groups will be formed representing the school communities, the business community and to reach groups with special mobility needs. Additionally, the TMP will have an online presence for surveys, mapping tools and other means of collecting feedback.

Draft Goals

On August 7, 2018, staff and TEI provided City Council with the initial project update (minutes attached). That discussion primarily centered on the draft goals and the public outreach. TEI has developed the initial set of draft goals based on review of currently adopted City plans and policies. The draft goals are intended to provide a starting point for discussion, understanding that the final project goals will need to be based on public input, and input from the City's Boards and Commissions and City Council. Staff anticipates returning to City Council on October 2 to adopt the final goals for the project. The following are the draft goals under consideration:

- Provide more choices for community access and connectivity to destinations
- Develop great streets that prioritize transportation options
- Enhance safety within the transportation network
- Support regional connections for residents, employees, and visitors
- Implement programs that enhance mobility
- Support development of walkable places

ATTACHMENT(S):

- August 7, 2018 City Council Meeting Minutes

Public comments – None.

Mayor Muckle closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Keany moved to approve Ordinance No. 1761, Series 2018, Councilmember Loo seconded.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN GOAL SETTING

Director Zuccaro stated this is the City's first transportation master plan providing a chance to combine all the policies and prioritize improvements as well as continuing to work with regional partners. Staff has been working with Traffic Engineers, Inc. (TEI) for the last several months, working with regional partners, reviewing information and data. Staff is about to kick off the public participation process and looking to Council for feedback on overarching goals and direction.

Traffic Engineers, Inc. presentation.

Shaída Libhart of TEI stated they have done data collection, plan review and existing conditions analysis. They have looked at the current plans and studies to provide a basis for the TMP. There are many overlapping goals; the TMP will identify linkages to existing plans and provide structure and recommendations to meet goals and assess progress.

They are looking at corridor volumes, a few major corridors carry the majority of vehicles. North-south access is generally most heavily used. The TMP will identify priority corridors and street designs that meet travel needs while providing mobility options. The multimodal network shows the highest activity areas have the greatest gaps in connectivity. Most heavily used corridors for vehicles are also used for transit and biking. Safe connections for people walking and biking between destination and neighborhoods are missing.

The TMP will identify new connections and strategies to better connect mobility options. Looking at safety shows the most heavily used corridors have the greatest number of crashes. Intersections present the greatest safety concern. Crashes involving people walking or biking are mainly along major corridors or in high activity areas. The TMP will look at potential safety improvement strategies for high crash locations.

Potential Outcomes of the TMP

- A shared vision for mobility options and street design
- An integrated approach for how people can move around the city, including

- walking, biking, driving, and riding transit
- A balanced network that provides for local and regional travel needs
- A comprehensive implementation strategy including projects, policies, and programs
- A prioritized implementation approach to address the shared vision
- The safest Louisville for people of all ages and abilities to travel in

Geoff Carlton of TEI defined the vision, goals, metrics and strategies of the project. Potential goals include:

1. Provide more choices for community access and connectivity to destinations
2. Develop great streets that prioritize transportation options
3. Enhance safety within the transportation network
4. Support regional connections for residents, employees, and visitors.
5. Implement programs that enhance mobility
6. Support development of walkable places

Mr. Carlton reviewed next steps which includes completing the existing conditions analysis. Then public outreach will identify community needs and barriers, community priorities and refine vision and goals.

Public comments

Audrey DeBarros, 839 West Mulberry St., thanked Council for this project and was excited the City will have opportunity to set priorities to better compete for funding. In regard to the goals, she suggested thinking about movement of people in a more meaningful way, include social equity in the plan with other modes of transportation, consider cost effectiveness and technology changes, add sustainability as a goal.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated 1) he would like consideration of time efficiency within and without the city, not necessarily want to slow everything down, some accommodation for this 2) walkability is a great goal, but given our land use patterns as a community this may not serve everybody's needs all the time and it may ignore other things we need to do and 3) he would like a goal added on supporting and enhancing economic sustainability.

Councilmember Stolzmann said in the presentation she heard a theme of consolidating past plans, building on past plans, etc. She noted the Council may want to depart from past plans or make changes and there is a need to keep that in mind.

Mr. Carlton noted this is a fresh look and part of this is to challenge how old decisions were made and what has changed.

Councilmember Stolzmann supported proposed goal 1 and wants to include more bike lanes and facilities but make sure to utilize all options to separate bikes and cars, not

just put bikes on streets. Mr. Carlton agreed the design system for a bicycle network needs to work for people of all ages and abilities.

Councilmember Stolzmann thought the goal 2 language could be clearer. She does want safe and good options, but travel times are still key. Mr. Carlton noted they would be trying to tailor the needs of the community at street level.

Councilmember Stolzmann supports calling out; economic sustainability, sustainability, technology, social equity and movement of people specifically in the goals. Mayor Muckle agreed.

Councilmember Loo stated this appears very car unfriendly which is really what people use. She feels Louisville is a suburban car-oriented community. We need to engage those people who are drivers. Multimodal is great, but shouldn't be at the expense of travel time.

Director Zuccaro stated TEI was picked because they have strong technical engineering and technical planning and staff has been communicating to them that we want a strong focus on vehicular traffic working well without excess planning lingo and mistrust. If we are missing something Council should tell us.

Councilmember Maloney would like the McCaslin area to be looked at for possible changes and how that affects transportation in that area. He agrees past plans should be considered but not geared to a certain result. Economic development and sustainability are important considerations in the process. This needs to be attached to the sustainability master plan as well.

Mr. Carlton noted they are talking to the folks doing the market study and will be taking a fresh look at all the transportation issues and considering the values as determined by Council and the community.

Councilmember Leh noted his frustration with public participation formulas seen in the past. There is a need to get the people who are really impacted, safety concerned groups, disabled and senior populations, the business community and larger employers. They need to be sure to include the McCaslin area. Think strategically and skeptically.

Councilmember Loo felt the key is to include the concerns of average folks.

Mayor Muckle stated it is clear this is a fresh take and an important project.

BUILDING PERMIT FEE REVIEW

Director Zuccaro noted staff was asked to review the building department fee structure and the costs to operate. Staff began by asking four main questions:

1. What are all cost factors for operating Building Safety program